



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/542,539

12/29/2005

Rajendra Kumar

117210.00045

7033

21324 7590 05/07/2007  
HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP  
One GOJO Plaza  
Suite 300  
AKRON, OH 44311-1076

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUAN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2618

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/07/2007

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@hahnlaw.com  
akron-docket@hotmail.com

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/542,539

**Applicant(s)**

KUMAR, RAJENDRA

**Examiner**

Tuan A. Tran

**Art Unit**

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the input/output unit" should be changed to "the apparatus" for consistency. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 32 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the integrated system" should be changed to "an integrated system" for consistency. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 40 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "the user" should be changed to "an user" for consistency. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 31-34 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bodnar et al. (7,072,688).

Regarding claim 31, Bodnar discloses an apparatus 10, 30 to provide input/output functionality in conjunction with an off-the shelf portable computing device

Art Unit: 2618

20, the apparatus 10, 30 comprising a portable housing having at least one selectable docking port 10 such that the apparatus is capable of mechanically docking and electrically interfacing to a portable computing device 20 in at least two operable configurations to the portable computing device 20 (See figs. 1A, 3A, 3B and col. 6 line 44 to col. 7 line 36).

Regarding claim 32, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 31. Bodnar further discloses the apparatus 10, 30 is a cellular phone 30, and is selectively docked to the portable computing device 20 to provide wireless communication capabilities for an integrated system formed when docked therewith (See col. 3 lines 58-60, col. 4 lines 13-38).

Regarding claim 33, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 32. Bodnar further discloses the cellular phone includes interface keypad, a display (cellular phone is widely known to include keypad and display), and a docking connector 40, 70 for mating with a standard electrical connector 60 associated with the portable computing device 20 (See fig. 1A and col. 6 lines 10-67).

Regarding claim 34, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 31. Bodnar further discloses the portable housing includes an additional keypad interface (keypad of the cellular phone 30), which is accessible when docked to the portable computing device 20 in at least one operable configuration (See figs. 3A, 3B).

Regarding claim 36, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 32. Bodnar further discloses the cellular phone 30 is fully operational when docked with the portable computing device 20, and data maybe exchanged between the portable computing

device 20 and the cellular phone 30 via a docking connector 40, 60, 70 (See fig. 1A and col. 4 lines 13-38, col. 6 lines 10-67).

Regarding claim 37, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 32. Bodnar further discloses the cellular phone 30 includes a first side having at least a first interface keypad, a display (cellular phone is widely known to include keypad and display), and a first docking connector (See fig. 1A), and a back side having at least a second docking connector for mating with an electrical connector associated with the portable computing device (See fig. 3A and 3B).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 35 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodnar et al. (7,072,688).

Regarding claim 35, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 32. However, Bodnar does not explicitly mention that the cellular phone is docked with the portable computing device such that the front of the cellular phone facing outward and the back of the cellular phone covering the front of the portable computing device to act as a lid for the portable computing device. Since Bodnar does suggest that the cellular can be docked with the portable computing device in multiple operational configurations (See figs. 1A, 3A, 3B) using various types of docking connectors (See col. 17 lines 14-21) and the

Art Unit: 2618

claimed docking configuration recited in claim 35 is merely a design choice; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the Bodnar's system with such claimed docking configuration for the advantage of accommodating the design's intention.

Regarding claim 38, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 37. Bodnar further discloses the cellular phone may be docked with its front side or back side facing the portable computing device (See figs. 1A, 3A). However, Bodnar does not mention that the cellular phone comprises a second keypad for data entry at the back side. Since cellular phone having a secondary rear keypad is known in the art (the examiner would like to present U.S. Patent 6,714,802) as evidence for the well known statement); therefore, it would have been obvious to one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add a second rear keypad (i.e. alphabetical keypad) for the advantage of making easier for the user to input text into the telephone without rely solely on the ordinary numeric telephone keypad.

Regarding claim 39, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 38. Bodnar further discloses the first and second docking connectors allow the cellular telephone to be coupled to the portable computing device in different orientations (See figs. 1A, 3A, 3B).

Regarding claim 40, Bodnar discloses as cited in claim 39. However, Bodnar does not explicitly mention that the cellular phone is docked with the portable computing device such that the front of the cellular phone covers the bottom portion of the front of the portable computing device such that the display associated with the portable computing device is visible to the user and the second keypad associated with the

Art Unit: 2618

cellular phone is accessible. Since Bodnar does suggest that the cellular can be docked with the portable computing device in multiple operational configurations (See figs. 1A, 3A, 3B) using various types of docking connectors (See col. 17 lines 14-21) and the claimed docking configuration recited in claim 40 is merely a design choice; therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the Bodnar's system with such claimed docking configuration for the advantage of accommodating the design's intention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Mager (7,095,986); Virtuoso (5,594,952); Kumar (7,149,543); Vannatta (5,924,044).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-7858. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 10:00AM-6:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Anderson can be reached on (571) 272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2618

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Tuan Tran  
AU 2618